

THE ORIGIN OF APOLLO

ROBERT S.P. BEEKES

Abstract

We shall argue that Burkert's etymology deriving the name *Apollo* from a Dorian word for 'assembly', ἀπέλλα, is linguistically and historically impossible. This means that the possibility of Anatolian origin is open again. It is argued that *Apollo* is a Pre-Greek-Anatolian name. The expected proto-form of this name is found in the name *Appaliunas*, a god of Wilusa / Ilios mentioned in a Hittite letter. This strongly suggests Anatolian origin of the name. This is confirmed by the Homeric epithet Λυκίηνης, which has long been recognised as an archaic formation meaning 'born in Lycia'. This fits well with the strong Anatolian connections of Apollo as well as his mother Leto and his sister Artemis.

Abstrait

L'étymologie proposée par Burkert du mot *Apollon* comme dérivé du mot *apella*, 'assemblée', est impossible, pour des raisons linguistiques et historiques. Il est donc possible que le mot, et le dieu, est d'origine anatolienne. Le nom est pré-grec-anatolien. La proto-forme expectée est trouvée dans le nom *Appaliunas*, dieu de Wilusa / Ilios mentionné dans une lettre hittite, ce qui est une belle confirmation d'une origine anatolienne. Ceci est confirmé par l'épithète homérique Lukégenés, 'né en Lycie'. Une origine anatolienne est en accord avec les liens d'Apollon lui meme, sa mère Leto et sa soeur Artemis avec l'Anatolie.

*1.1. The problem**

In 1975 Burkert wrote an article on the origin of (the name) *Apollo*. He discarded the supposed connection with Anatolian names, and proposed that the name *Apollo* was Doric, deriving it from the word ἀπέλλαι, 'meetings'. In 1994 he re-iterated this view. Burkert's reasoning is as follows. The formal agreement can hardly be coincidental; the *apellai* probably comprised the initiation of the young people who had reached adulthood; Apollo was very much connected with this, he was "das Urbild der im Initiationsfest aufzunehmenden Jünglinge." (p. 11).—In the present study I shall argue that Burkert's etymology

* I thank professors Bremmer, Ruijgh and Versnel for various kinds of advice.

is impossible, that the case for one of the Anatolian names is quite strong, and that an Anatolian origin of the god is most probable.

I will not venture an opinion on religious aspects, as this is not my field. Burkert's religious suggestions on this point may well be correct. See e.g. Versnel 1993, 313-319. But they do not lead to the proposed etymology; they would fit the etymology, but do not prove that it is correct. My aim is primarily linguistic, but I shall add some remarks on the origin of the god.

1.2. *The Greek substratum*

In order to clarify my point of departure, I will start with a few remarks. Burkert has a surprising passage (p. 13) where he states: "Nun ist es ebenso bezeichnend wie verwunderlich, dass die griechischen Götternamen etymologische Durchsichtigkeit geradezu mit System vermeiden; ...statt der lokal bezeugten, gut griechisch klingenden *Eleuthia* hat sich die bizarre Eileithia durchgesetzt; Ariadne statt Ariagne..."¹ The author suggests that the difficult name is recent, the transparent name is the old one. Every linguist confronted with such a situation will draw the opposite conclusion: the untransparent variant is the old one, the understandable one a younger adaptation.² In 1992, 79 Burkert acknowledges the principle.

What is at stake here is of course that Greek has numerous words from the language spoken in Greece when the speakers of Indo-European arrived there, the substratum language, Pre-Greek.³ (The historical fact is not mentioned in the article.) This fact explains why many names of Greek gods are unintelligible: the substratum language was quite different from the Proto-Greek which the arriving

¹ The author probably refers to Heubeck (1972). But see, except the dictionaries of Frisk and Chantraine, Szemerényi 1964, 208 and Beekes 1998, 24-26.—Prof. Ruijgh points out to me that Homeric Εἰλειθία for Myc. *Eleuthija* may be due to metrical lengthening of the first vowel, -ει- to assimilation to -υα, while Myc. -ija may be a facultative rendering of -υα.

² When I checked the subject in his *Greek Religion* (1985, 182), I saw to my surprise that Burkert had not withdrawn this view ("the intelligible name forms are displaced"). On the contrary, he gives a curious explanation. "Clearly the object is to make the individuality of a person not physically present, stand out more memorably by giving him a striking name, just as orthographical complications are introduced into many English names." This theory is astonishing, as since Kretschmer's *Einleitung* it is known that we are dealing in these cases with loans from another language, which accounts for the unintelligible forms. And the theory is based on facts that do not exist.

³ See on Pre-Greek my survey (2003).

people introduced. Whoever wants to see how different, may just look at a text in Lydian or Carian—and these are Indo-European languages, only *influenced* by the substratum. In the Greek lexicon—I am presently working on a new etymological dictionary of Greek—a considerable number of words derives from this substratum.⁴ In the case of names of gods the percentage may well have been higher than elsewhere. As Burkert observed in the passage cited, the Indo-European element is almost restricted to the name of Zeus.⁵ It is also generally accepted that a large number of place names is non-IE. So we may a priori expect to find Pre-Greek names for gods.

It is also generally accepted that the Greek substratum was closely related to the language from which the pre-Indo-European names of (at least western) Asia Minor stem. Again, place names are obvious cases in point; I need not refer to Haley's classical study of 1928. Recently I read a study of the non-Greek Cretan place names (Brown 1985). My conclusion is that here we find the same elements as elsewhere in the Greek pre-Indo-European placenames. My conclusion, then, is that there was one language, or a group of (closely) related languages, that formed the Greek substratum. And the origin of this language is Asia Minor as was shown by archaeology. The importance of this observation in my view has not been duly recognized, I think: Greece and Asia Minor formed for thousands of years a unity; there was a linguistic and cultural unity in these areas. We are talking then, of course, about the period before 2,000 BC, perhaps from the seventh or sixth millennium onwards. This makes our problem even more complicated. If a name can be shown to be Anatolian, it can be a loan from Anatolia, but also a loan from the substratum in Greece.

2.1. *The Thessalian form*

We start with the deviant Thessalian form, Ἄπλων (-ων from -ων is normal in Thessalian.) Of course, the loss of a vowel, especially after the stress (if we start from the vocative Ἄπελλον) is unproblematic in general; the point is whether it can be demonstrated for Greek, and especially in Thessalian. Fraenkel discussed the problem (1956, 82-88). He states that such syncopated forms occur especially in

⁴ Furnée 1972 is an invaluable handbook for these words. Chantraine recognized the import of the question in his *Formation*, but in his etymological dictionary little reference is made to it.

⁵ Thus I doubt that the name Poseidon is (partly) of Indo-European origin.

Thessalian and Macedonian. He starts with *Λάσαν· τὴν Λάρισσαν*, and adds *Ἄστο- < Ἄριστο-, πέσσαντας < περιστάντας, σκόρδα < σκόροδα, Βερ(ε)νίκα, Σπάρ(ά)δοκος*. Though he remarks that such phenomena are frequent after resonants, he thinks that this syncope explains the name of Apollo. However, he seems not to have noted that *all* instances he mentions regard vowels after an *-r-*, and this is not what we have in Apollo. For the special position of *-r-* in this process one need think only of Lat. *ter < *t̥rs < *tris; -er < *-ros* as in *Alexander*. The conclusion is that Fraenkel's suggestion does not offer an explanation for the Thessalian form of Apollo. Curiously enough, Fraenkel (84) does recall Thumb's suggestion that the syncope may be due to a substratum.⁶ This supports my idea that we have to do with the rendering of a foreign, i.e. Pre-Greek, name. Burkert himself stated that: "Die thessalische Variante ist nach indogermanisch-griechischen Lautgesetzen kaum zu erklären;" (p. 3); for a Greek word such a conclusion is significant.

The matter may seem to be of little importance, but it is decisive. A vowel does not disappear in Greek. It is unthinkable that for ὄφελος one would find *ὄφλος. I may also recall ἄφενος, which has an adjective ἀφνειός, where the absence of the *-ε-* is a serious problem for linguists. The word is often considered a loan from Anatolian (see e.g. Heubeck 1961, 70).

On the other hand, Furnée (1972, 378-385) gives a large number of words for which there is reason to regard them as substratum words, that have variants with and without vowel after consonant (and mostly before resonant). Some examples are: (378) ἄκαρον—ἄγχραν, (379) ἰξαλῆ—ἰσθλῆ, κάπ(π)αρις—καπρία, (380) κόχλος—κοκάλια, πηκτίς—μάγαδις, σιφλός—σιπαλός etc. etc. Note (283) Αἰγλάτας—Ἀσγελάτας, a surname of Apollo! A well-known case (though with *-r-* preceding) is Ἄρπυια—Ἄρεπυία (on which see Beekes 1998, 25f.).

Prof. Ruijgh suggests to me that the Thessalian form derives from a variant **Apelōn*, with single *-l-*, which makes the syncope easier. I agree with prof Ruijgh that the palatal feature of Pre-Greek phonemes (in this case *l'*) was sometimes rendered in Greek and sometimes ignored; this resulted in e.g. λλ beside λ, as in *Achilleus* : *Achilleus*.

Further, if, as Burkert surmises, *Apellon* (s. below) is of Doric origin and spread over the whole of Greece, it is most improbable that it

⁶ The comparison with Etruscan is not justified, because the syncope in this language is very late.

did not reach even the Thessalians, who lived close to them.⁷ We conclude so far that the name Apollo is probably of Pre-Greek origin, and that it is improbable that it is of Doric origin.

2.2. *The vocalism*

The other dialects have Ἄπολλον and Ἀπέλλων; on the Cyprian form see below. As regards the vocalism, there are two issues. One is the relation between *-e-* and *-o-*; the other is whether, as Burkert claims, the *e*-form is typically Doric. There are some serious flaws in his reasoning.

Burkert starts from the generally accepted interpretation that the form of the name with *o*-vocalism arose from the form with *e*- through vowel assimilation (in the vocative: the advantage would be that in the vocative Ἄπελλον the relevant vowel was unstressed; however, I think that the accentuation was irrelevant to assimilation in Greek). This idea seems quite reasonable,⁸ but the matter is, in fact, not so easy. Assimilation of this kind is a quite normal phenomenon in language, but in Greek it is rare. Here the vowels are quite stable. Schwyzer notes that assimilation notably occurred in vulgar language: “Nur in einzelnen Fällen sind Distanz-Assimilation [und -Dissimilation] früh durchgedrungen ...” (p. 254). Rix, in his historical grammar (1976, 17), gives as example the well-known Att. ὄβολός, since 450, “in der häufig gebrauchten Münzbezeichnung. Sonst bleibt att. /e/ erhalten, auch zwischen zwei /o/ (ὄφελος).” (Note that in the last word the relevant vowel is unstressed). The number of assimilations of this kind is very limited; s. Schwyzer and Schmidt (1893, 323-340); Lejeune 238; and even not all forms given are correct: to my mind ὀδόντες is not due to assimilation but derives from **h₃dont-* (Kortlandt; s. Beekes 2003b). That αἰόλος derives from **αιελος* is debated. Note that some words are loans from other languages: ὄροβος, ἀκόλουθος. A special case is Ἐρχομενός—Ὀρχομενός (the town itself has E-; note that the variation is already Mycenaean, *Ekomeno*—

⁷ Hegyi 1989 argues for a pre-Hellenic origin of Apollo, but the arguments are very general and therefore to my mind not decisive. The author adduces, e.g., many names associated with the cult of Apollo (e.g. Hyakinthos) which are pre-Hellenic. This is correct, but it can be observed almost everywhere in Greek religion.

⁸ Influence of ἀπόλλυμι on *Apellon* is quite improbable; the association is understandable when the form was *Apollōn*, but it would have operated on *Apellōn*; also Apollo is not at all a typical killer.

Okomeno).⁹ It is significant that Chantraine (DELG) writes: : “On a supposé que Ἀπόλλων viendrait de ... Ἄπελλον par ‘harmonie vocalique’”, a formulation which betrays little enthusiasm. It is for this reason that I came to consider the possibility that the name is a substratum element, which would account for the variation.

However, when I studied the distribution of the forms (the name ‘Apollo’ itself and the personal names derived from it) of which Burkert gave a survey (1975, 6-9), I became more and more convinced. We see that the *e*-forms are being replaced by *o*-forms, and also that the earliest *o*-forms occur in the name of the god itself, where the *-e-* was followed by the *-o-* of the *-on-*suffix. One can hardly avoid, then, the conclusion that the *-o-* is due to assimilation; otherwise it would be ignoring the facts. Thus, the Ionian cities in Asia Minor had *-o-* in the name of the god beside *-e-* in the personal names. Only Athens, Attica had always *-o-*. This reminds one of the fact that the name Orchomenos has *E-* in the town itself, but *O-* when referred to in Attic. Though this evidence is rather meagre, it suggests that the assimilation to *-o-* occurred first in Attica, and perhaps with the Ionians. Note that Boisacq already had seen this: “cf. du reste les n(oms) pr(opres) Ἀπελλέας Ἀπελλᾶς Ἀπελλῆς Ἀπελλίς Ἀπελλίων Ἀπέλλιχος, toutes formes où cette assimilation ne pouvait se produire”. This is also the view of Burkert, p. 6. However, Burkert seems not to realize that this means that the *-e-* is not Doric: before the *-e-* was assimilated to *-o-* in one or more areas, all dialects had *-e-* and it was not typical of Doric.—Prof. Lubotsky points out to me that assimilations in general occur more often in loanwords (than in inherited words)

That the *e*-form was the original and general form is confirmed by the following considerations.

1. The Cyprian form *Apeilon-*. Burkert finds this “eine ernsthafte Schwierigkeit” (p. 17). He starts from the idea that the forms with *-e-* (as opposed to those with *-o-*) are of Doric origin. His conclusion is that in the Cyprian form “eine sehr frühe Entlehnung vorliegen muss.” He gives two considerations to overcome this difficulty. One is that in Asia Minor an old goddess received in the Persian period the (Persian) name Anahita. This comparison is quite irrelevant as there has never been a Dorian occupation of Cyprus. The imposition of the Persian name is quite understandable, the (alleged) Doric name in Cyprus cannot be explained along these lines. His other

⁹ The most remarkable case of assimilation is to my mind ὄροφή, ὄροφος from **h₁rebh-*. Perhaps here the first vowel was considered part of the ablaut.

consideration is that the Dorian conquests will not have happened overnight: Pre-Dorian Amyklai and Dorian Sparta will have existed side by side for generations, during which the Doric name could have been taken over (and subsequently been brought to Cyprus). I cannot say that this is impossible, though it would be surprising that people on their flight take with them the name/god of the enemy for whom they flee. It is much more natural to assume that the Cyprian form was the old form of that language or area, brought to Cyprus by the fugitives. It has always been interpreted this way; see e.g. Boisacq s.v. It is only Burkert's idea that the *e*-forms must be Doric that creates a problem here. The situation is quite important as it shows that the *e*-forms are not (only, exclusively) Doric. In the material presented by Burkert we time and again find that *e*-forms are replaced by o-forms, so that one is almost forced by the material to conclude that the *e*-form is original. I will return to this point below.

2. Another point is that the personal names with *-e-* are found "im ionischen Bereich Kleinasien: Kyzikos, Kolophon, (Phokaia-) Massalia; Chios, Erythrae, Priene, Iasos." (Burkert, p. 7). It is most improbable that these *e*-forms were first borrowed from the Dorians (in the Peloponnese) and then brought to Asia Minor (which is what Burkert's view implies), all the more so as in these places the name of the god himself has *-o-*; one would rather expect that people might at the same time have borrowed the form Apellon from the Dorians. Again, it is much more natural to assume that the Ionians brought their own (*-e-*)form to Asia Minor. This implies that the *e*-form was the original one, and that it was not Doric.

3. That the form with *-e-* is original would also follow if Ruijgh (1967, 56) is right in interpreting Myc.]*pe-ro*₂[, i.e.]*pe-tjo*[, in a Knossos text as *apejonei* = *Apeljonei*, the dative of *Apellon*. Heubeck (1987, 180) accepts this as possible. He seems not to be aware that this is almost fatal to Burkert's theory. He comments: "Den im dorischen Bereich wurzelnden Gott der Apellai bereits im 13. Jahrhundert bei nichtdorischen Stämmen zu finden, dürfte in Anbetracht der Verbreitung, der die Apollonkult ... bereits in archaischer Zeit über ganz Hellas hinweg gefunden hat, nicht allzu sehr verwundern." This reasoning is only correct if Apollo is indeed a Dorian god. For those who do not start from this assumption, the Mycenaean fact shows that Apollo is *not* a Doric name. And it also shows that the form had *-e-* from the very beginning.¹⁰

¹⁰ Heubeck here repeats his notation *Apellōn*. I don't favour this idea; Greek

4. Further evidence for old *-e-* comes perhaps from Old Phrygian. The inscription M-05 (Brixhe-Lejeune 1984) reads *apelan0mekastevano*[(0 indicates a crack in the stone). We know that *mekas* is a separate word. It is hardly credible that the form, if it represents Apollo, is due to Dorian influence. That *apelan* means ‘Apollo’ is not certain, however.

2.3. Dorian origin

So far we reached the following conclusions: the name originally had *-e-*, and got *-o-* first in the name of the god itself where it was followed by *-o-* in the next syllable; this happened first in a restricted area. From there it spread widely, probably due to the cultural-political preponderance of the Ionic-Attic world.

Now Burkert claims that the name originated in Doric. “Das Namenmaterial weist, ..., auf die besondere Rolle des dorischen Bereiches hin; .. Die “alte These K.O. Müllers”, ..., dass Apollon von Haus aus ein Gott der Dorier sei, scheint sich zu bestätigen.” (p. 8) This is a mistake. Reference is to the fact that Doric preserved the *-e-* better than the other dialects. But that a group *preserved* an old form better than others does in no way mean that this form *originated* in this group. The *e*-form is the old one, once common to all Greeks (of which some changed the *-e-* to *-o-*), and Doric preserved it best; but there is no indication at all that the *e*-form arose among the Dorians.

That the name of the god is not of Dorian origin, as Burkert assumes (deriving the name from Doric *apellai*) follows from the following consideration. In Homer, of course, the name *Apollon* is frequent. Now Burkert’s view supposes that the name *Apellon*, derived from *apellai*, was taken over by the other Greeks (where it became *Apollon*). In short, the name Apollo in Homer goes back to the Doric name Apellon. This, however, is impossible, because Homer contains *nothing* that is of Doric origin. There is complete agreement on this point. So it is simply impossible that the name of Apollo was a loan from Doric (in the form Apellon). This means that the name cannot be of Dorian origin.

If the form cannot be Doric, it could still be assumed that the name was derived from *apellai* if we assume that this word was *not*

never had, as far as we know, a phoneme /l/. So the usual transcription with *-lj-* (or *-ly-*) is simply better. At most *-lʰ-* was an intermediate phonetic stage, but there is no use to burden the transcription of Mycenaean with it.

exclusively Doric, but common Greek. We know the word, and the institution, only from Delphi, Laconia and the Lycurgen Great Rhetra, so it seems to be Doric. But this does not mean that it did not, in early times, also occur among other Greeks. Evidence for this may be found in Hesychius' gloss ἀπαλλάζειν ἐκκλησιάζειν, Ἴωνες—supposed that we emend to *ἀπελλάζειν. However, Burkert pointed out that the parallel for the *apellai* elsewhere are the Apatouria. (The identity follows from the sequence γαμήλιον—μεῖον—κούρειον in the latter, which has its parallel in the sequence γάμελα—παιδήα—ἀπελλαῖα in the first; p. 10). But the term Apatouria is age-old (< **a-patoru-* < **sm-patru-*, a stem which is not known from elsewhere in Greek).¹¹

So far, then, we concluded that 1. the *e*-form is not typically Doric; 2. there is no indication that the name arose in Doric; 3. Dorian origin is on general, linguistic-historical grounds, impossible.

2.4. Other difficulties

Burkert proposed that the name *Apello* was derived from ἀπέλλαι. This would mean that the connection of Apollo with the *apellai* was strongly felt, and in that case it is very unlikely that the name of the god would have been changed by assimilation to Apollo. That the Apella-god Apellon was rebaptized Apollon is an unacceptable idea. Even if it was the effect of regular sound change, the *o*-form would have been removed by restoring the *-e-*; this holds all the stronger in the case of an—incidental—assimilation. This alone suffices to reject the proposed explanation of the form Apollo. The only way out would be to assume that at the place and time when the assimilation occurred, the connection with *apellai* was no longer felt (which would be an improbable assumption for those who accept Burkert's etymology).

There are several other difficulties with the etymology. One is that you would expect the derivation to mean 'God of Meetings', which

¹¹ On p. 13 Burkert remarks "dass ἀπέλλαι keine indogermanische Etymologie hat kommt erschwerend hinzu." The point is that, should Burkert's etymology be possible, the word must have had *-ly-* (because the name of the god had *-ly-*, as is shown by the Cyprian form). Now we simply do not know, but this is well possible: Greek *-λλ-* comes from *-ly-*. If the word is a substratum word, *-λλ-* probably derives from *-l'*, a palatalized *-l-*. (The substratum language probably had no geminates, and it did have palatalized consonants as phonemes, as mentioned above. Cf. e.g. the unexplained words in *-ελλα* (δίκελλα, μάκελλα, ἄργελλα) and see Chantraine *Form.* 252. See my interpretation of Pre-Greek 2003.

clearly does not concur with what we know of the god. So it must have meant, as Burkert sees it, ‘God of the Assembly-of-Initiations’. But the gloss on *apellai* says (glosses often are not cited in full, which is a serious mistake): σηκοί, ἐκκλησίαι, ἀρχαιρεσίαι Hesych. This means that the lexicon first gives the most literal meaning, then the more general (‘meeting’), and finally the most important event from the *apellai*, and that appears to be ‘the election of the (yearly) magistrates’; the initiation of young men is not mentioned. The idea implies that the name of the god originated as a surname, ‘the God of the Initiation’. However, one would have expected a more evident reference to this celebration, e.g. after the specific part, during the Assembly, when the young men were initiated, rather than vaguely to the Assembly. In this function the god was (inter alia?) called *Patrōios*, which is a much more evident name (Nilsson 556; Graf 1996, 867: “in die Funktionen früherer Initiationskulte eingegangen sind”).

If it is maintained that the Apellai are a Dorian institution, and that Apollo’s name originated from the Dorians, we must assume that the other Greeks took over as a name ‘He (the God) of the Dorian Assembly’, which is too improbable to be discussed.

It need not be reminded that the derivation from *apellai* was proposed earlier (but rejected because of its improbable adstruction). Nilsson 556 wrote: “In dem Geschlechterfest der ἀπέλλαι spielt Apollon eine so geringe Rolle, ...; sein Name kommt nur vor neben denen des Poseidon *Phratrios* und Zeus *Patrōos*...” One might doubt, then, that Apollo’s connection with it was so central as to provide his name.

2.5 *The formation*

Heubeck 1987, 180 states that *Apellon* is derived from *Apellai* with the characterizing suffix -ων, -ωνος, referring to Risch 1974, 56. This is, however, a misunderstanding, and I think that this derivation is impossible. The suffix is found in words like στράβων ‘(somebody who is) squinting’, γάστρων ‘pot-belly’, Πλάτων ‘broad-shouldered’. The suffix is also found in Latin, the type *Catō*, *Nasō*. The Latin words show the same use as the Greek ones: they indicate an individual, (very) personal, often corporeal, quality, a quality that is (often) innate; often also the qualification is not really laudatory. It is a ‘suffixe familier’ (Chantraine 1933, 161). This is also shown by the fact that it makes ‘Kurznamen’ (Risch l.c.). This is not what we have

in the case of Apollo's (supposed) relation with the Assembly; this would be more a *function* of the god, a connection.

Burkert is aware of this problem (p. 14). He admits that our case does not fit in either category. He thinks that the suffix spread, and was used for names derived from appellatives which are not Kurznamen, citing as examples from Risch: *Dolon*, *Thoon*, *Chalkon*. However, in my view, these fall into the two categories mentioned. The first two names characterize a person by δόλος or as being θοός (which is an adjective). *Chalkon* will be a shortened name (what else could it mean?), cf. Hom. Χαλκωδοντιάδης.

The 'connection' of the god with the Assembly would have been expressed with a suffix like -ιος, -ειος, in the case of *ā*-stems -αιος. Cf. Zeus Agoraios, Apatourios, Storpaios. Of some 60 surnames of Apollo listed by Nilsson (index 872) many have -ιος, none -ων. The formation is shown by the name of the month Ἀπελλαῖος, '(the month) of the Apella(i)'.¹² In the same way we would expect a god who is connected with the Apella(i) to be called Ἀπελλαῖος. We see this formation indeed in the case of Apollo worshipped in Athens in a cave of the citadel: he is called ὑπακραιός (Nilsson 557); well-known is Ἀμυκλαῖος; Apollo of Phanai (near Chios) was called Phanaios (Graf 1985, 51); cf. Apollo Aktaios, in the Troad (Furnée 309). (The suffix -ων can be added to *existing* names, but this would give *Ἀπελλαιών, a form also existing for the month name.) Thus, the explanation as a derivation with -ων from the word ἀπέλλαι is highly improbable.

2.6. The value of an etymology

Finally I would like to point out that, even if no objections could be raised to the etymology, an etymology is mostly no more than a possibility. Mostly an etymology cannot be *proven*, it can just be shown to be not impossible. In this respect the position of an etymology is different from most other questions. Of course, everybody knows that an explanation which seems to be possible, may nevertheless prove to be not the correct one. It seems necessary to stress these points, considering the fierce defence of Heubeck (1987, 179 and 182). Even if there were no objections, I would consider this etymology rather implausible.

¹² Prof Ruijgh writes me that he thinks that the month name meant 'month of Apellōn'. This implies the existence of a variant of the gods name *Ἀπελυ-ᾶς, for which cf. *Ἐρμᾶσ-ᾶς (Myc. *ema₂*) beside *Ἐρμᾶσ-ων (Dor. Ἐρμᾶν).

2.7. *The name of the Dorian assembly*

Shortly before Burkert's article de Sainte Croix, in his 1972 book added an appendix (346f.) on the name of the Spartan assembly. Following others he argued that it was normally called ἐκκλησία, not ἀπέλλα, basing himself notably on Thuc. 5. 77, 1, who cites in Dorian a decision of the assembly, which says: δοκεῖ τῷ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ...; he further adduces Xenophon and gives other arguments. This seems quite convincing to me, but I leave this to historians. If he is right, it is clear that Burkert's etymology loses its basis. The *apellai* would only be an annual festival. The author assumes that its name was "connected with Apollo"; this will mean that *apella* was derived from *Apellon*. Again, if this is correct, Burkert's etymology is impossible. However, I have some doubt on this interpretation as the gloss ἀπελ<λ>άζειν· ἐκκλησιάζειν Hesych. suggests that the word ἀπέλλα could be used in the same function as ἐκκλησία, and because the glosses ἀπέλλαι· σηκοί, ἐκκλησίαι, ἀρχαιρεσίαι H. and ἀπέλλειν· ἀποκλείειν H. seem to point to a development 'enclosed space' > 'meeting place, meeting' (in general), which seems reliable and which cannot be combined with a derivation of *apella* from *Apellon*.¹³ It seems quite possible to me that ἀπέλλα (note that the accentuation is unknown) simply was an archaic word for 'assembly', and that it was gradually ousted by ἐκκλησία.—To make things even more complicated, there is a Doric term ἄλια 'assemblée', and Attic ἡλία would be a false Ionisation of the Doric word (!); see Chantraine's etymological dictionary (s.v. ἄλις).

3. *Anatolia and the Near East*

3.1. *Appaliunas*

Burkert rejected the two Anatolian words that might be cognates of Apollo. The first is Lyd. *Pldans*, which was supposed to be Apollo. However, it has become clear that the first sign is a *q* (= *k^w*), which in some cases represents an Indo-European labio-velar. This has been quite convincingly shown by Heubeck (1959, 15-30).

The other form is Appaliunas, in a list of gods by whom the parties swore in the treaty between the Hittite king Muwattalis and

¹³ The gloss (?) ἀπέλλειν· ἀπέργειν H., cited by Burkert 1975, 13 n. 50, I cannot find.

Alaksandus of Wilusa.¹⁴ There is a serious problem in that immediately before the form *appaliunas* the text has a lacuna. Thus it seems possible that the beginning of the name was not complete, but this is now no longer thought. Thus Neumann 1998, 23: “vermutlich am Wortanfang komplett.” Starke (see below), too, seems to see no problem here. Burkert added (p. 5) that the identification of Wilusa as Troy is untenable, and that of Alaksandus as Alexandros doubtful. On the last two points the situation has changed. At present both identifications are, I think, almost generally accepted.

Of course it is true that the lacuna makes things less certain, but the difficulties must not be exaggerated. I give the text as it was recently translated by Starke (in Latacz 2001, 138).

Nun siehe, in selbiger [Sache] habe ich, [die Majestät, labarna,] Grosskönig, Liebling des Wettergottes des Blitzes, [die Tausend Götter] einberufen, um sie zu Zeugen zu machen, und sie sollen zuhören [...]: ... alle Götter des Landes Wilusa, den Wettergott des Heeres, [zwei Götternamen], Appaliuna, die männlichen Götter, die weiblichen Götter, die Berge, [die Flüsse, die Quellen,] den Unterirdischen Wasserlauf des Landes Wilusa habe ich, [die Majestät, labarna, Grosskönig,] Liebling des Wettergottes des Blitzes, in [selbiger] Sache einberufen.

The situation is quite clear: the Hittite king—who dictates the treaty to Alaksandus, as he stresses—invokes the gods as witnesses, all gods of the land Wilusa, the Storm-god (the highest of the gods)... Appaliuna, all other gods (male and female), mountains, [rivers, sources] (of the land Wilusa, of course) and a special feature of the land Wilusa. Though in principle we can never know what was in a lacuna, it seems almost certain that in this case, as Starke indicates, one or two gods, perhaps with a title, were invoked, and that Appaliuna is yet another god. It should be noted that only few gods are mentioned, so this Appaliuna must be a quite important god in that area; it also appears to be quite probable that he is a god venerated (especially) in the land of Wilusa. This would excellently correspond with the fact that Apollo appears as the defender of Troy in the Iliad. It is further confirmed by evidence concerning Apollo mentioned in Etruscan context, which I will discuss below.

Then there is the form of the name. In Greek we have *Apellon-*, reconstructed because of Cyprian *Apeilon-* as **Apelyon-*. As I stated above, I think that this name is of Pre-Greek origin. Now I have recon-

¹⁴ In 1994 Burkert still repeats the fact that Hrozný read *Apulunas* on Hittite altar stones. It has long been recognized that this was a false reading, and it should no longer be recalled, as if it were an argument.

structed the phonemic system of Pre-Greek as containing the vowels *a*, *i*, *u* only (Beekes 2003). Also I indicated that in my view this language had a palatal phoneme *l'* which was rendered in Greek as *λλ* or *λ* (as in Ἄχιλ(λ)εός). I assume that in our form *-li-* indicates the palatal quality of the *l*, and this palatal quality explains the fact that the second *-a-* appears as *-e-* in Greek. Thus I reconstruct for Pre-Greek **Apal^{l'}un(-)*, and this form is exactly what the Hittite text gives. This means that this text has the form from which Gr. **Apelyon* developed! Note also that the Hittite text has a typical Indo-European/Hittite ending *-as -*, which in Greek would be **Apellōnos*.

3.2. *Lycia*

Apollo has always been associated with Lycia. His Lycian origin was notably advocated by von Wilamowitz in 1903. Since then this idea has been widely accepted, until Burkert proposed his etymology; see Nilsson 1967, 529-564. Burkert himself recognized (after he proposed the etymology) the arguments for eastern, and especially Lycian origin. In his *Religion* (144f.) he mentions the following points: 1) that Homer states his Lycian origin; 2) that he is the defender of Troy and the enemy of the Greeks; 3) that there is an old connection between Delos and Lycia (the Delians called upon Apollo to appear from Lycia; Simonides, PMG 519. 55); 4) the oracles in Asia Minor, from the south-east to the Troas (“oracles that give the impression of being old and deep rooted in pre-Hellenic traditions”, Burkert 1994, 51.¹⁵

Burkert further accepts a Syro-Hittite connection: 5) the comparison with Rešep, known from Ugarit and Cyprus, who sends the pest with his bow, as did Apollo; 6) the number seven in connection with the cult of Apollo (which is not a Greek feature). He also mentions the Hittite Guardian God (but without references); and 7) Apollo's surname Alasiotas on Cyprus, which contains the Bronze Age name of Cyprus, Alashia. This is quite an impressive list. Nilsson gives more (559-564; e.g. that the songs used in Delos were ascribed to a Lycian singer).

¹⁵ See on the oracles Parke 1985, 184: “whose traditions evidently reached back to native origins.” This is most obvious in Herodotus' description (1, 182) of the functioning of the oracle at Patara, which very much resembles a hieros gamos; which is clearly a non-Greek institution. Parke's final conclusion states (198): “The cult which was paid to Apollo by the Hellenes appears to have been practised on the same sites, whether to a god of the same name or not, in Pre-Hellenic times in such places as Didyma, Claros, Hierapolis, Telmessus, Patara and Seleucia.”

Of great importance is the Homeric epithet of Apollo, Λυκηγενής. It is now generally accepted that it means ‘born in Lycia’. The explanation of the term is known since Kretschmer 1933, 227ff. Strangely enough, neither Frisk nor Chantraine mention this.¹⁶ Chantraine repeats the old interpretation that it originally contained the word for ‘wolf’: “En ce cas Λύκιος et Λυκηγενής seraient des altérations destinées à introduire la notion de Lycie.”¹⁷ However, there is not the slightest ground for the view that Lycia was later introduced in the Homeric epithet. (Note that, if the poet wanted to clearly introduce Lycia, he could have done so by using the well-known name Λυκίη, for *Λυκη-γενέι can be used in a hexameter.) This may be the reason why, as recently as in 1985, Kirk (ad Δ 101) states that the interpretation of Λυκηγενής is uncertain. Kretschmer pointed out that Greek had also names of countries in -η, not only in -ίη, an important one being Φοινίκη (which is an old name of Caria).¹⁸ That there was an old name for Lycia without -i- is proved by the Hittite form *Lukkā*. Thus Λυκηγενής contains this old form for ‘Lycia’. The importance of this solution is that the form Λυκηγενής is very old, and therefore also the idea (‘born in Lycia’). Secondly, it occurs in a verse which may well be an old formula (Δ 119): εὔχετο δ’ Ἀπόλλωνι Λυκηγενέι κλυτοτόξω (repeated in Δ 101 with the imp. εὔχεο). So our oldest source says, in a probably old formula with an archaic form, that Apollo originated from Lycia. Homer in the epithet stated common knowledge, or at least traditional knowledge, as always in epithets. So there is not the slightest reason to doubt that this is a reliable, old statement.

The only argument against Lycian origin is the following. In the Xanthos trilingue the personal name Apollodotos is rendered by *Natrbbiyēmi*, which shows that Apollo was called *Natr* in Lycia, so that Apollo cannot be of Lycian origin (e.g. Burkert *Gr. Rel.* 144 n. 14.). I think that such a conclusion is premature. *Natr* can for example be a local surname. If in Greece we only had one inscription with the

¹⁶ Chantraine refers to Heubeck, *Praegraeca* 47; this must be 54, but he also incorrectly renders what Heubeck said: he did in fact accept Kretschmer’s solution. (On the other hand Heubeck (n. 121) says that the idea is from Wilamowitz, which is incorrect.)

¹⁷ Freu 2002 pleads for ‘born of a wolf’. He seems not to realize that this is impossible: it would require *Λυκο-; e.g. Nilsson 537 n. 5.

¹⁸ To the list must be added Εὐρώπη. That is why it is not *Europia! Note that names in the same area and with the same suffix -ο/ωπ- do have -ια, e.g. Ἄλωπια. Thus, we may expect that the land *Hapalla*, mentioned in Hittite texts and identified with Greek Καβαλίς, originally had a form in -η.

name of the god Apollo, and this inscription had Phoibos, we would be wrong in concluding that (the name) Apollo was unknown in Greece. As to Natr, Prof. Van den Hout writes me that the name may rather be Carian. Lycia was at that time part of the Carian satrapy under the Hekatomnids, and Natrbbiyemi and his colleague represented the authorities. Further, the other evidence for Natr is from Caria (*ntro* on a votive inscription, and the name *Neterbimos* in inscriptions from Mylasa).¹⁹

Important for Apollo's origin seems further that also his mother, Leto, and his sister, Artemis, are, as is generally admitted, at home in Anatolia. Nilsson stated (562): "Leto hat keine selbständige Existenz in Griechenland, sie ist nur Mutter des Apollon und der Artemis". Thus Burkert (*Gr. Rel.* 171f.): "In Lycia, Leto, [as the Greek equivalent of a Mother of the Sanctuary,] was elevated to the position of principal goddess; ... Otherwise, as far as the Greeks are concerned, her role is defined simply as mother of the divine twins [= Apollo and Artemis]." (The term "was elevated" is of course based on the view that she was in origin "Greek".) Graf (1985, 61) writes that the communis opinio that Leto originated from Lycia "dringend einer Revision bedarf." However, this is the authors view; the indications he adduces can easily be explained otherwise. That Leto is called 'Mother' (62 n. 110), which is typically Anatolian, is hardly an argument against her Anatolian origin (as the Lycian interpretation of a Greek goddess: it could as well be an indication that she always was an Anatolian 'Mother'). In 1996, in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* s.v. Leto, Graf writes: "In myth, her only role is to be the mother of Apollo and Artemis."; and "she is curiously absent from cult in Delphi." (*Myc. rato* may represent the (a) town Latos in Crete, derived from Lato/Leto.)

As to Artemis, Burkert (*Gr. Rel.* 149) writes: "Immediately apparent are her close connections with Asia Minor... Asia Minor elements seem to have been taken over wholesale by Greek cities..."

¹⁹ Here I may recall Hesychius' gloss Ἐρεθύμιος [Latte wrongly -ίμιος]: ὁ Ἀπόλλων παρὰ Λυκίοις. (καὶ ἑορτὴ Ἐρεθύμια.) It is clearly a variant of Ἐρυσίβιος. Strabo tells us (13, 1, 64) that the Rhodians said ἔρυσθίβη for Att. ἔρυσίβη. This was doubted by modern scholars, but it is confirmed by the Lycian form; and Rhodian inscriptions have ἔρεθειβιάζω ('belong to the worshippers of Apollo E.') and Ἐρεθίμιος, ἔρεθειμάζω and Ἐριδίμιος. These forms, with interchange θ/σ (cf. τεύτλον/σεύτλον, ἀννηθον/ἀννησον), β/μ, υ/ι, the un-Greek suffix -ιβ-, are clearly Pre-Greek; see Furnée 1972, 214, 255f. It is hard to draw conclusions from this material, except, perhaps, that there was a relation between Rhodes and Lycia, which is historically quite understandable.

So for the whole family strong connections with Anatolia are clear. Also such minor stories as Niobe²⁰ and Marsyas are firmly located in Anatolia. It is not easier to assume that they were brought there by the Greeks; on the contrary, it is easier to assume that they originated there than that they were so well adapted to their new surroundings. Also, in general gods come from the east (cf. Dionysos), not from the west, except much later when Greek culture had become so dominant, and when the Greek presence was much stronger. If the Greeks first met the gods in Anatolia around 1200, it may not surprise that they had their own development in the Greek world; therefore their Greek character in e.g. the seventh century is not an argument.

Prof. Ruijgh points out to me that the Mycenaeans were aware of the Anatolian origin of some gods. Thus in Pylos the tablets mention *potinjā asiwija / Potniāi Aswiāi (or Aswiās)/*, who is the same as *matere teija / Mātrei thehijāi/* ‘to the mother of the gods’; *Assuwa* is in north-western Anatolia.

[Add. See the discussion by Keen 1998, 194-201, and Hutter in Melchert 2003, 236.]

3.3. *The Etruscans*

As to the date and origin of Apollo, I think the following may be important. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1, 23, 5) relates: “For the Pelasgians [= Etruscans] in a time of general scarcity in the land [Italy] had vowed to Zeus, Apollo and the Kabeiroi tithes of all their future increase.” This shows that they honoured, beside the Kabeiroi (Hdt. 2, 52 states that the cult of the Kabeiroi on Samothrake was a Pelasgian cult and he makes it quite clear that with ‘Pelasgians’ he means the Tyrsēnoi = Etruscans), Zeus, who is no doubt the Stormgod, Etr. Tarchon, and Apollo. As I have shown the Etruscans came from near Troy (Beekes 2002), so this means to my mind that the Etruscans brought Apollo with them from the Troad. As is known, Dionysius of Halicarnassus is in details reliable (not in his general view of the origin of the Etruscans) and I see no reason to doubt his story on this point. Also, Apollo is not an evident name to add without ground, in this case. (The Etruscan name *Apulu*, later *Aplu*, however, is not an ancient form but derived from the Greek name.

²⁰ There is a version (Hyg. fab. 9) that Leto was insulted because Niobe ridiculed her because of her clothes. Does this point to unusual, i.e. foreign dress of the goddess?

But this does not mean that the Etruscans cannot have brought the god with them, in much earlier times.)

In this connection it may also be mentioned that Kyzikos, the founder of the city of that name (in the heart of the territory of the Tyrsenoi, in my view), would be a son of Apollo (Konon, FGrHist 26 F3; see e.g. Lochner-Hüttenbach 1960, 55; according to the same author (F 2) there was another son of Apollo in the early history of Antandros/Andros). It may confirm that Apollo was deeply rooted in that area.²¹

3.4 *Cyprus and the Near East*

Some evidence has been presented for an origin further east. It was Burkert himself who in 1975 (he refers there to his forthcoming article *Apellai und Apollon*) draw attention to possible connections of Apollo with the Semitic god Resheph. He points out that Resheph-figures (mostly a standing figure with a spear raised in his right hand, the type of which lives on in later figures of Zeus and Poseidon) are found in Greece since Mycenaean times (XIIIth cent) in sanctuaries, also those of Apollo. Resheph, known since the beginning of the second millennium, is (also) a pest god, 'Herr des Pfeiles', like Nergal with whom he is identified. On Cyprus Resheph is identified with Apollo. Burkert suggests (74ff) that on Cyprus a Minoan-Mycenaean god was fused with Resheph.²² Burkert also discusses a god *Mkl* (vocalization unknown) who was associated with Resheph, and whose name has been compared with Amyklai. Burkert is very sceptic about this connection, I think rightly so.

Schretter too (1974; independently of Burkert) argues that Apollo had an old cult on Cyprus. One argument is (164) that there is an Apollo Alasiōtās. Alashia is the name of Cyprus in the 12th and 14th century. This seems to be an important argument. Masson (1960,

²¹ Burkert 1975, 4 mentions a special veneration of Apollo in Kyzikos, but without reference.

²² In n. 108 and 109 Burkert refers to suggestions that the name Resheph lives on in Greece. One is the epithet of Apollo Ἐρυσθίβιος. The basis of this epithet is Rhodian ἐρυσθίβη = Att. ἐρυσθίβη 'rust in plants'. This word, however, is a Pre-Greek word, as its many variants show (Ἐρεθίβιος, Ἐρεθίμιος, ἐρεθειβ/μιάζω etc.; see n. 19 above); and it means 'rust'! The other word that would continue the name Resheph is Arsippus, the father of (the third) Asklepios, mentioned by Cicero (ND 3, 57). Linguistically this seems difficult to me. And there is a woman's name (which one would not expect) Arsippe, daughter of Minyas; Hesychius glosses the same form as ἡ Ἀλκέστις (I don't know where this refers to). So this too seems rather to be a (local) Greek name.

135) argued that he was the main Eteocyprian god of the island.

Schretter's connection with the god's name MKL is less convincing. I understand that not much is known about this MKL. Schretter (168) suggests that the name may have been pronounced *Amkul (which is uncertain). Then he argues that *k* before *u* could have become *k^w*, and that *k^w* could have become *p*. (Note however that in Indo-European **k^w* before *u* lost its labial element and, in Greek for example, did *not* become *p*, whereas in other positions it did.) He then suggests that *Ampul, thus reconstructed, could have become *Appul, which led to Apollo. But the loss of the *m* would be quite difficult; in Greek one does not expect it. Certainly wrong is his idea that the cluster *-pp-* is still seen in the length of the first syllable of Apollo in Homer. This length, however, is a metrical licence (compare ἀνέρος, ἀνέρι with long first syllable; cf. Chantraine 1958, 252). It occurs only in the inflected forms (Ἄπολλων-, where short A- is also found), which shows that it is dependent on the metrical structure of the word form, not on the etymology of the word.²³

Another possible indication that Apollo was known much further east may be Apollo Kataōn, i.e. 'of Kataonia', the southern part of Cappadocia, mentioned by Strabo (12, 6, 6). It is said that he was venerated all over Cappadocia. One may object, however, that this is a god who was at some time identified with Apollo but who was not the same in origin.²⁴

4. Conclusion

We have seen that Burkert's etymology deriving the name *Apollo* from a Doric word for 'assembly', ἀπέλλα, is linguistically and historically impossible. This means that the possibility of Anatolian origin is open again. It was argued that *Apollo* is a Pre-Greek-Anatolian name. The expected proto-form of this name is found in the name *Appaliunas*, a god of Wilusa/Ilios mentioned in a Hittite letter. This strongly suggests Anatolian origin of the name. This is confirmed by the Homeric epithet Λυκηγενής, which has long been recognised as

²³ The same mistake had already been made by Usener; see Nilsson 555.

²⁴ I have not gone into Apollo's presumed northern origin. The article of Klothe (1970) is not serious. (Just to cite one passage (227): "denkbar wäre allerdings auch eine donauländisch-bronzezeitliche Entwicklung von *kel* oder *kyel* zu *pel* in der ursprünglichen Bedeutung '(Wolfs-)Hund'." Note 5 gives more information about the "pelunische Suffix *-um-*". What Pelunia is, is not clear; according to the map it is in Hungary.)

an archaic formation meaning ‘born in Lycia’. This would fit well with the strong Anatolian connections of Apollo as well as his mother Leto and his sister Artemis.

Bibliography

- Beekes, R.S.P. 1998 “Hades and Elysion.” In *Mir Curad*. Studies in honor of Calvert Watkins, edd. J. Jasanoff, H. C. Melchert, L. Olivier, pp. 17-28. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- . 2002 “The prehistory of the Lydians, the origin of the Etruscans, Troy and Aeneas.” *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 59, 3-4: 205-241. (Also in 2003 *The Origin of the Etruscans*. Amsterdam: Kon. Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen.)
- . 2003 “Pre-Greek. A language reconstructed.” Appendix to *A Greek etymological dictionary*. <http://iiasnt.leidenuniv.nl/ied>.
- . 2003b “Historical Phonology of Classical Armenian.” In: Kortlandt-Beekes, *Armenica*. Ann Arbor.
- Boisacq, É. 1916 *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Heidelberg/Paris: Winter/Klincksieck.
- Brixhe, C. 1976 *Le dialecte grec de Pamphylie*. Paris: Librairie d’Amérique et d’Orient Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Brixhe, C. – Lejeune, M. 1984 *Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes*. Paris: Editions Recherche sur les Civilisations.
- Brown, R.A. 1985 *Pre-Greek speech on Crete*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Burkert, W. 1975 “Apellai und Apollon.” *Rheinisches Museum* 118: 1-21.
- . 1985 *Greek religion*. Cambridge Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press.
- . 1992 *The Oriental revolution*. Cambridge Mass./London: Harvard Univ. Press.
- . 1994 “Olbia and Apollo of Didyma: A New Oracle Text.” In: *Apollo. Origins and Influences*, ed. J. Solomon, pp. 49-60. Tucson/London: Univ. of Arizona Press.
- Chantraine, P. 1933 *Formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- . 1958 *Grammaire homérique*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- . DELG *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque*. Paris 1984: Klincksieck.
- Fraenkel, E. 1956 “Zur griechischen Wortforschung.” *Glotta* 36: 77-92.
- Freu, J. 2002 “À propos de l’épithète Lykégenés.” *Le Muséon* 115: 6-10.
- Furnée, E.J. 1972 *Die wichtigsten konsonantischen Erscheinungen des Vorgriechischen*. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Graf, F. 1996 “Apollo.” In: *Der Neue Pauly* 1, 823-868.
- . 1985 *Nordionische Kulte*. Rome (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana XXI): Schweizerisches Institut.
- Haley, J.B. “The coming of the Greeks.1. The geographical distribution of Pre-Greek place-names.” *American Journal of Archaeology* 32: 141-145.
- Hegyí, D. 1989 “Prehellenic Roots of the Cult of Apollon.” *Acta Antiqua Academiae Hungaricae* 32: 5-121.
- Heubeck, A. 1959 *Lydiaka, Untersuchungen zu Schrift, Sprache und Götternamen der Lyder*. Erlangen. [no ed.]
- . 1961 *Praegræca. Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum vorgriechisch-indogermanischen Substrat*. Erlangen. (Erlanger Forschungen A: 12). [no ed.]
- . 1972 “Etymologische Vermutungen zu Eleusis und Eleuthia.” *Kadmos* 11: 87-95.

- Keen, A.G. 1998 *Dynastic Lycia*. Leiden/Boston: Brill (Mnemosyne Suppl. 178).
- Kirk, G.S. 1958 *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Klothe, H. 1970 "Apollons ethnokultureller Herkunft." *Klio* 52: 205-230.
- Kretschmer, P. 1896 *Einleitung in die griechische Sprachwissenschaft*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (Reprint 1970).
- . 1933 "Die Hypachäer. Alaksandus und andere umstrittene Namen der hethitischen Texte." *Glotta* 21: 213-257
- Latacz, J. 2001 *Troia und Homer. Der Weg zur Lösung einer alten Rätsels*. München/Berlin: Koehler & Amelang.
- Lochner-Hüttenbach, F. 1960 *Die Pelasger*. Wien: Gerold.
- Masson, O. 1960 "Cultes indigènes, cultes grecs et cultes orientaux à Chypre." In: *Éléments orientaux dans la religion grecque ancienne* (Colloque de Strassbourg, 1958). Paris. [no ed.; non vidi]
- Melchert, H.C. (ed.) 2003 *The Luwians*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
- Neumann, G. 1998 "Sprachvergleichendes zur Kaunos-Bilingue." *Kadmos* 37: 19-32.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1967 *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*. München: Beck.
- Parke, H.W. 1985 *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*. London etc.: Croom Helm.
- Risch, E. 1974 *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter.
- Rix, H. 1976 *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*. Darmstadt: Wissensch. Buchgesellschaft.
- Ruijgh, C.J. 1967 *Études sur la grammaire et le vocabulaire du grec mycénien*. Amsterdam: Hakkert.
- Sainte Croix, G.E.M. de 1972 *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London: Duckworth.
- Schmidt, J.H. 1893 "Assimilation benachbarter einander nicht berührender vocale." *Zeitsch. f. vergleich. Sprachforschung* 32: 321-394.
- Schretter, M.K. 1974 *Alter Orient und Hellas*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- Szemerényi, O. 1964 *Syncope in Greek and Indo-European and the Nature of Indo-European Accent*. Naples: Istituto orientale di Napoli.
- Versnel, H.S. 1993 *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion*, 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. von 1903 "Apollon." *Hermes* 38: 575-586.

See now Sarah Morris in U. Muss, *Der Kosmos der Artemis von Ephesos*, 131-151, on the Anatolian Artemis. See also the comment of Hutter in Melchert 2003, 268 f.

